

From: Dennis Rome
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 8:38 PM
Subject: media monopolies

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,
Dennis P. Rome
Saint Amant, La

From: Neal Mutarelli
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 8 42 PM
Subject: Please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely, Neal M

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

From: Joseph Vito
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 8 43 PM
Subject: FCC - DO THE RIGHT THING FOR AMERICA

Dear Ms Abernathy

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

The proposed changes would result in the following

- * independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations
- * Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor
- * The big media conglomerates have in the past used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air these changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspaper

Bottom Line many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes - including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC - are precisely the same companies that have tried in the past to keep MY VIEWPOINTS OFF THE AIR

THIS IS NOT WHAT AMERICA WANTS !

Joseph R Vito
609-433-6251 cell
609-259-1643 home

From: naborsdw
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 8 49 PM
Subject: Freedom of information

It is my belief that any FCC action that has as short or long term results the concentration of media ownership to fewer and fewer corporations is counter to the public interest. That fewer and larger companies own and control larger percentages of media outlets threatens what already appears to be a fragile United States democratic system. Is the "freedom" we bring to the Iraqis a condition of life that we are willing to allow to slip from us so that massive, soulless corporations can accumulate ever more wealth? I hope not, but it seems to me that the last bulwark of freedom of information in this country is the FCC. Please do not abandon us to the corporations who will, if they are not countered by government, exploit us all to the limit of their capability and to the detriment of the deepest values of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

From: Kass911@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9:06 PM
Subject: deregulation

dear Sir

I am very concerned about the plans to lift restrictions on media ownership. As a former college teacher I often used the (late) Philadelphia Bulletin and the Inquirer to teach my students to see different points of view about an issue. The death of the Bulletin left the students with only one point of view on many issues which they mistakenly believed was the whole truth. The proposed legislation which will allow one person to own newspapers, radio and television in the same market will further restrict freedom of thought and varied points of view on the same issue. Owners can use their media to promote their points of view on political and social issues while preventing the people in their territories from having access to opposing ideas. I do not believe that democracy can thrive where access to ideas is controlled by a few. Please allow more time for public discussions about this proposed legislation. It will have far-reaching effects on what Americans can read in the papers and hear on television. Americans deserve a chance to learn about and discuss the implications of this legislation and contact their congressional representatives before a vote is taken. Sincerely, Carol Kasser

From: Anne Adams Helms
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 12 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding. By allowing our media outlets to merge print and broadcast facilities a greater restriction on the breadth of news and information available to citizens to act in the public interest will result.

To promote competition, diversity and local content, the FCC should retain the current media ownership rules and impose stricter public interest requirements.

The studies commissioned by the FCC are flawed and incomplete.

In addition, I strongly encourage the Commission to hold hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions.

Thank you,

Anne Helms
25350 Camino de Chamisal
Corral de Tierra, CA 93908

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein,
john_mccain@mccain.senate.gov

From: Ed Oltarzewski
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 23 PM
Subject: Do not relax broadcast ownership rules

Dear Madam,

Diversity of opinion is necessary for a healthy society. It is therefore essential that it be maintained in the newsrooms of the American media.

I urge you to resist any attempt to relax the broadcast ownership rules which prevent media monopolies.

Respectfully,

Edward Oltarzewski
4 Moro Dr
Mercerville NJ

From: BentonF225@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9:26 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules matter

To the Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission

Official petition "I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. The proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record of attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in the USA."

In this case, I believe maintaining limits on broadcast ownership is the only responsible course of action because it maintains the political and social benefits to the citizens which the freedom of the press was and is intended to bring about. Monopoly growth, on the other hand, by greatly attenuating what is allowed on the media, undermines the basic process of learning the facts involved in issues fully and fairly, which is fundamental to a responsible electorate and good government in general—it is essential to our political system's correct functioning. I think if the FCC sets the wheels in motion to extinguish the light of independent voices, the ascendancy of huge media monoliths which replaces independence with gross censorship and blatant propaganda, as opposed to really reporting the facts. It will be like Iraqi state television and the USSR's Pravda were. Economics is not the highest value of national interest here in this matter and it is clear to me that the need is to preserve the benefits of a open system by preventing a vast consolidation of control over our nation's media. What's the difference government taking over control of the mass media and a private company doing the same thing? I see no difference in terms of the grave danger and massive potential for evil which it represents, as an unchecked, totalitarian thing controlling information. Have we forgotten what control of information was used for and did to Japan, Italy, Russia and Germany? How dare anyone presume that we are too good for propaganda and tyranny to appear can flirt and fool around with same dangerous form of centralized, ego-directed information control without fear of loss of our freedoms? We break up monopolies that threaten the monetary economy and this is a case of equal merit in terms of preventing monopolies from threatening the political economy. We have just seen a number of allies show their true colors. The question, it seems to me, is about long-term trust and sound design of our society to remain free and I do not trust that more monopoly in the media is prudent in that regard.

Sincerely,
Mr. Frederick G. Benton, III
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

From: BentonF225@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 26 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules matter

To the Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission

Official petition "I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. The proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record of attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in the USA."

In this case, I believe maintaining limits on broadcast ownership is the only responsible course of action because on that maintains the political and social benefits to the citizens which the freedom of the press was and is intended to bring about. Monopoly growth, on the other hand, by greatly attenuating what is allowed on the media, undermines the basic process of learning the facts involved in issues fully and fairly, which is fundamental to a responsible electorate and good government in general—it is essential to our political system's correct functioning. I think if the FCC sets the wheels in motion to extinguish the light of independent voices, the ascendancy of huge media monoliths which replaces independence will deal in gross censorship and blatant propaganda, as opposed to really reporting the facts. It will be like Iraqi state television and the USSR's Pravda were. Economics is not the highest value of national interest here in this matter and it is clear to me that the need is to preserve the benefits of a open system by preventing a vast consolidation of control over our nation's media. What's the difference government taking over control of the mass media and a private company doing the same thing? I see no difference in terms of the grave danger and massive potential for evil which it represents, as an unchecked, totalitarian thing controlling information. Have we forgotten what control of information was used for and did to Japan, Italy, Russia and Germany? How dare anyone presume that we are too good for propaganda and tyranny to appear can flirt and fool around with same dangerous form of centralized, ego-directed information control without fear of loss of our freedoms? We break up monopolies that threaten the monetary economy and this is a case of equal merit in terms of preventing monopolies from threatening the political economy. We have just seen a number of allies show their true colors. The question, it seems to me, is about long-term trust and sound design of our society to remain free and I do not trust that more monopoly in the media is prudent in that regard.

Sincerely,
Mr. Frederick G. Benton, III
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

From: Kenneth Bumgarner
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, FCC FCCINFO
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 27 PM
Subject: Fw Notice of Objection to New Check Destruction Policy!

Chairman Powell, Commissioners

AT&T has instituted a new policy of destroying the physical checks sent by customers to remit payment in settlement of monthly accounts

I am sure that you are all aware of the hazard in which customers of AT&T are placed - without customer consent - of this 'policy' The destruction of those negotiable instruments removes absolutely any opportunity for defense against error or malicious acts perpetrated by the processing staff at AT&T Payments misapplied will not show up on customer bank accounts - who will not be able to prove that they sent in the payment and that the payment was in fact processed by AT&T

This strips away any protections that the consumer has in dealing with misdirected payments, penalty fees, extra charges, interest on those charges - and other fines and levies AT&T has been known to attempt - it all now will rest in the hands of billing clerk or customer service representative - and you are aware of the difficulty in getting these people to correct anything (and not just at AT&T) even with concrete evidence

What can be done to prevent AT&T from carrying out it's policy unless the individual customer has in fact been properly informed and has in fact consented to be a part of that process What can be done to provide exclusion for those of us who do not wish to place full faith in their process?

I have included a communication I sent to AT&T concerning this matter

Thank you in advance for your consideration and your assistance

Best regards,

Ken Bumgarner
Charlotte, North Carolina

----- Original Message -----

From "Kenneth Bumgarner" <kbumgarner@worldnet.att.net>
To <customer_service@att.com>
Cc <kbumgarner@att.net>, <askdoj@usdoj.gov>
Sent Friday, May 02, 2003 6 55 PM
Subject Notice of Objection to New Check Destruction Policy!

Please advise the Name and Address of the Credit Mgmt Center Executive

I am specifically lodging an objection to your new check destruction policy unilaterally issued

=====

Referencing the notice in the April 25, 2003 bill I received today regarding

the future handling of checks received as payment

- 1) You are NOT authorized to send information from my check electronically to my bank for payment
- 2) You are NOT authorized to send an image copy of that check to my bank for payment
- 3) You are NOT authorized to destroy that instrument
- 4) You ARE authorized to present that check, intact, to my bank for payment that I may receive my cancelled check as proof that you received my payment

=====

Unfortunately, your record over the last 15 years or so is such that it is necessary to be able to take a cancelled check into court to demonstrate that you did receive payment - without regard as to staff errors and mishandling - and that the excessive charges for late fees and other penalties you levy are to be removed

Destroying a legal instrument and record of payment is not a lawful act! Taking this action unilaterally jeopardizes the consumer and provides opportunity to further abuse customers who will have no recourse or defense against errors, deliberate or accidental, by the staff of A T & T

This will not be tolerated

Warmest Regards,

Ken Bumgarner
Charlotte, North Carolina

CC: kbumgarner@att.net

From: iluvmyhk@juno.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9:27 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Michael Williams
Millington, Tennessee 38053-4968

From: iluvmyhk@juno.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9:27 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Copps

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Michael Williams
Millington, Tennessee 38053-4968

From: Gary Aigen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 32 PM
Subject: Concentration of media ownership

Chairman Powell,

As an avid listener of radio and frequent watcher of tv news I urge you to not allow large media owners to further concentrate the ownership of the public airwaves

It is already very difficult to find independent voices on the major broadcast media and I believe our democracy can only benefit from easier access to non-mainstream opinions

Thank you for your time,
Gary Aigen

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier Bingo
[http //search yahoo com](http://search.yahoo.com)

From: Sarah Duffy
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9:34 PM
Subject: Media Ownership

Greetings

I am watching Michael Copps on NOW with Bill Moyers. I urge you to pressure the Chairman to delay the vote on this issue and hold well-publicized hearings across the country so that the people may be heard on this issue.

Sincerely,

Sarah Q. Duffy
22 Courthouse Square #503
Rockville, MD 20850

From: Allan & Jef Jones
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9:39 PM
Subject: Media ownership

Commissioner Abernathy

Please do what you can to stop additional concentration of media ownership! It's bad enough already

Allan Jones

From: Jeannette Wilson
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 41 PM
Subject: Deregulation of media

Thank you for your appearance on NOW I do not want a megaloply deciding my choices and limiting my opportunities to view/hear/read differing points of view Please offer me suggestions how to carry on Have you contacted Commom Cause as an ally in developing sites for hearings?

Jeannette Wilson
P O Box 2016
Tahlequah, OK 74465 (918)456-4341

From: Allan & Jef Jones
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 41 PM
Subject: Media ownership

Commissioner Copps

Please do what you can to stop additional concentration of media ownership! It's bad enough already

Allan Jones

From: Mildred Katz
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 43 PM
Subject: Concern for democracy

To Members of the FCC, Vermont Congressional Delegation, and President George Bush

We must prevent all our media from being dominated by a few corporations
There can be no democracy without our media being representative of many groups, communities, states, etc Right now there is much too much dominance of the press and TV by a few large corporations No to further consolidation

Mildred P. Katz
Bennington, VT

CC: George Bush, Sanders Bernie, Leahy Patrick, Jeffords James, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, mcoops@fcc.gov, kabernet@fcc.gov

From: David Oppenheim
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 45 PM
Subject: Media deregulation

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am writing to voice my opinion on the issue of media deregulation. I believe that the American media is being increasingly dominated by a small group of corporations, and that this contributes to a lack of diverse voices in the media. As such, I think that the remaining regulations which prevent individual media companies from owning too many media outlets are extremely important. I urge you not to allow any more such regulations to be repealed. Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

David Oppenheim

Help STOP SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

CC: Michael Copps

From: Jeannette Wilson
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 9 53 PM
Subject: Monopoly of media

I strongly oppose and protest the reduction of rules limiting ownership of media outlets. We are developing a monopoly on information. What ever happened to "trust-busting"?

Jeannette Wilson
P O Box 2016
Tahlequah, OK 74465

From: Jim Dunlop
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjmweb@fee.gov, jadelste@fcc.com
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10:01 PM
Subject: upcoming vote on media ownership

Please DO NOT permit increased concentration of media ownership when you vote on June 2. I am VERY concerned about diminution of our free press and the right of the public to know what is going on in our country when media ownership gets into fewer and fewer hands. If anything, I urge you to further limit the ability of any person or corporation to reach a large percentage of the population. There should be no common ownership of radio, TV and newspapers in significant U.S. markets. I am especially concerned about Rupert Murdoch.

James Dunlop
85 Clifton Ave
Marblehead, MA 01945

CC: Dick Cole, UU Church of Marblehead/Kristen Fehlhaber, Judy Dunlop, Roxanne Fleszar, Mary Harrington, Mary Rosborough, Mike Gery, Adele Mitchell, Catherine Hier, Christine Krom, Dick Cole, Rosalie Cutticia, Paul Tremblay, Lee VanBremen

From: Enid Rothenberg
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10:04 PM
Subject: media ownership

I just saw and heard you on Bill Moyers' "Now" and want you to know I have sent an email to Mr. Powell urging against deregulation and FOR more public discussion of this very serious issue. Thank you for the work you are doing. Enid Rothenberg, South Egremont MA

From: Orville Poole
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10 08 PM
Subject: Do what is right for the country

Commission Chairman Powell

I urge you to do what is right for the good of our country on the upcoming decision on media ownership

There are far too few independent owners of broadcast media today and any thought of doing anything that would reduce that number will be in the interest of increasing the power of the few at the expense of us all

Additionally I would urge you to consider reinstatement of the "Fairness Doctrine" in the interest of fairness and balance in broadcast media. Currently we are deluged 24/7 with hate-mongering programs that are dangerously divisive and play on the imagined fears and real bias' of the American public.

Your leadership is desperately needed at this juncture in American politics and business.

O Gail Poole
ogaps35@earthlink.net

From: Enid Rothenberg
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10:08 PM
Subject: media ownership

I heard you and saw you tonight on Bill Moyers' "NOW" and want you to know that I have sent an email to the Chairman urging him to support more discussion of this serious issue and to vote against deregulation. Thank you for your work on this issue. If you get two of these, it is because the first one seemed to "disappear" but may have found its way to you anyhow. Enid Rothenberg, South Egremont MA

From: Greg Bynum
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10 12 PM
Subject: Do what's right for America! Don't loosen media ownership limits!

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I urge you not to do immense damage to our noble American democratic ideals by permitting even further consolidations of corporate control over the media. If anything, there should be more limitations on corporate control in this area, not less. "Anti-trust" must be our motto at this moment in our history.

Thank you for your attention. Best wishes.

Sincerely,
Greg Bynum
U S Citizen, Student
New York City

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier Bingo
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: STEVEAD
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, pmcopp@fcc.gov, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10:12 PM
Subject: Media Ownership

Dear Commissioners, please do not allow the media companies to own more stations or information services. Competition is shrinking every day. We have lost one of my favorite local programs here because Clearchannel had two competing stations in our area. Soon there will be no diversity. It's gone way too far already.

From: E Anderson
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10 15 PM
Subject: New proposed FCC "deregulation" of media ownership

Dear Ms. Abernathy

In short, I implore you to vote down these proposed deregulation rules. It is my belief that these proposed rules will weaken our democracy. Even now with the amount of allowed multiple ownership, the level of public discourse represented by media news coverage and or enlightening programming has been greatly diminished. The level of diversity of viewpoints available on the public airways is truly appalling. Ownership of the means of delivering and shaping news by just a few is a great threat to our democracy. We have just been privy to how the ability to project one point of view can be detrimental to a robust public discussion by the practices of some radio stations in response to citizens who disagreed with the administration's position re Iraq. To ensure a healthy democracy we need to have the ability to hear many differing viewpoints. The "Clear Channels" of the world do not provide this need.

Thank you for your attention

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Anderson

From: susan ford
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10 21 PM
Subject: June 2 vote

Dear Ms Abernathy,

I urge you to vote against easing the media ownership regulations

Thank you for your consideration

Susan R Ford

From: E Anderson
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, May 2, 2003 10:23 PM
Subject: New FCC regulations re multiple media ownership

Dear Mr. Copps,

As one concerned citizen, I beg you to not vote for these new regulations. We need to have a multiplicity of opinions and viewpoints available via the media, print and non-print, and not just a multiplicity of pathways for the expression of one viewpoint. It is a threat to the democracy for a single (owner) identity to have the ability to "blanket" the nation with a single vision of truth and justice. Please do not enable this process.

Thank you
Elizabeth Anderson